

2nd February 1923]

II

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL.

(1)

With reference to the answer given to the question supplemental to question No. 294 asked at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 16th September 1922, the SECRETARY laid on the table a *statement showing the commission drawn by the Official Assignee of Madras in each of the years 1918—1921 and the commission paid to Messrs. Dowden & Co., the auctioneers of the Official Assignee, during those years.

(2)

The SECRETARY also laid on the table † G.O. No. 63-A, Finance, dated 18th January 1923, regarding the nomination of Mr. C. E. Wood as a member of the Standing Finance Committee.

III

DEMAND FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1922-23.

Grant XXXII.

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" Sir, I beg to move—

That the Government be granted an additional allotment of Rs. 10,00,000 under 47. Miscellaneous—Miscellaneous and unforeseen charges—on account of compensation to be made for losses sustained during the recent Mappilla rebellion in Malabar.

"Mr. President, I feel it particularly unfortunate that after the warning given yesterday on the subject of supplementary grants in general it falls to me to stand before the House and move a supplementary grant for 10 lakhs of rupees. I am quite confident, however, that the House will feel that this particular case is not an illustration of the perpetual extravagance of the department which I have the honour to administer, and will view the demand with favour. The 10 lakhs are required for compensation for losses sustained by private persons in Malabar during the rebellion. The word 'compensation' is not perhaps strictly correct. We have been advised from the very outset that the Government were not under any legal obligation to give compensation. We published our decision to that effect and it has never been seriously questioned. At the same time, the Government did recognize that whatever could be done for those unfortunate sufferers in Malabar should be done, and they decided that as an act of grace the fines and confiscations levied on persons convicted in connexion with the rebellion should be set aside to be distributed among the sufferers.

"The details of the demand which I make fall into two sections. In the first place, we have already collected in the shape of fines a sum of about 2 lakhs of rupees. That money has gone into the head 'Judicial'. What I am now asking the Council to do is to transfer the money so as to let me have it, in pursuance of the promise already made by Government, for the purpose of distributing it among those who have suffered loss of property. That, Sir, accounts for 2 lakhs out of 10.

* Vide Appendix B at page 1634 infra.

† Vide Appendix C at page 1635 infra.

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

"The position of the remaining 8 lakhs is this. We have imposed already fines which amount to 9 lakhs over and above the 2 lakhs already collected.

"In accordance with the policy introduced last April and in pursuance of our desire not to send to jail a single man whom it was not necessary to imprison, we initiated the system under which those who were not charged with the most serious offences had their sentences of imprisonment suspended and were left to pay the fines imposed on them in instalments of two years. The result is that of these 9 lakhs of rupees a small portion only is being received every month and it will take us two years to collect the whole. Now, Sir, in regard to this what I ask the Council to do is to anticipate that receipt and let us have now the sum of Rs. 8,00,000 for distribution among the sufferers. It is most desirable that we should finish off this business as soon as possible. It would not do to hand over the Rs. 2,00,000 already collected to some of the sufferers and tell the others that they must wait until the rest of the money is collected. I hope therefore that the Council will be pleased to grant for this purpose the sum of Rs. 8 lakhs in anticipation of its subsequent recovery as I have explained; about the recovery I have no doubt whatever. The fines are of very small amounts, the majority of them not exceeding Rs. 50. I do not think that the Council need have any doubt as to their recovery.

"I quite realize that I may be asked the question how I arrive at the sum of Rs. 10,00,000 which I propose to give as compensation. To some extent it represents only an approximation; but we have as a basis the amount already issued in loans for the purpose of reconstructing damaged houses and for enabling the sufferers who lost their property to carry on until the next harvest. The House will perhaps remember that a sum of Rs. 10,00,000 for this purpose has been included in the current year's budget. When martial law was withdrawn and the troops left, and we wanted to begin the process of reconstruction, the conclusion came to was that the quickest and at the same time most cautious way of doing it would be not to make grants of money, but to start with the grant of loans, some of these loans being free of interest for one year. The amount which has been so utilized for giving loans is very nearly Rs. 9,00,000. But there are persons who for one reason or another did not ask for the loans, some who did not actually want money to carry on their agricultural or other operations, and some others who did not exactly come under the category of agriculturists, etc., who were entitled to the grant of loans. Lastly, in the case of Hindu temples, applications for loans have been received and they represent a case which I think we should, in fairness, take up if we can. It is for the purpose of writing off about Rs. 9,00,000 of these loans and of providing a further two lakhs for persons who did not apply for loans, that I now ask for the grant of Rs. 10,00,000 on the whole.

"Then, Sir, I may also be asked why it is that I cannot wait until next year, and why I should ask for this amount now as a supplementary grant. Well, the answer to that question is connected with this system of loans. As I said, these loans were mostly issued free of interest for one year. In some cases that period is fast approaching completion, and I know that there is a certain amount of apprehension in the minds of some people who have taken

2nd February 1923]

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

Grant XXXII—cont.

loans as to what the attitude of the Government is going to be in regard to the further extension of the period. Some people, I understand, have been kind enough to tell them that the Government want to take the whole loan back and insist upon its pound of flesh. That is not a fact. But I should like to allay that apprehension, and it seems to me the best way to do it is to declare at once that we are practically wiping out these loans. I have consulted every one who could give me advice on the subject and they all agree that as regards these thousands of people who suffered damage and who received loans, the most satisfactory way of relieving them now is to wipe out the loans. It is for that reason that I did not want to wait till next year, that is the time of the budget, before bringing the matter before the Council. At the time the budget will be passed, the period of one year for which the loans run free of interest will have expired in the case of a large number of people.

“So far as the financial aspect of this matter is concerned, the House will observe that all I am asking for as regards Rs. 8,00,000 of this grant is really to transfer it from loans and put it under grant, that grant being recouped by receipts from fines which will ultimately appear in another part of the budget. I may tell the House that Mr. MacMichael who is dealing with matters connected with Malabar generally has been permitted to appoint a committee to advise him as to the distribution of the money which the Council may grant among those who may not have happened to take loans. It is impossible formally to constitute that committee until some money is given to be distributed. But if the Council passes this demand to-day, I understand that the committee will be ready at once to make proposals. They have paid particular attention to a matter to which I have referred, that is, the distribution of some kind of compensation for the restoration of the very numerous Hindu temples which have been damaged. I think hon. Members of this House will feel that those temples should receive consideration. I am afraid, Sir, the matter is a little complicated. I have done my best to make it clear. But if any hon. Member desires further information, I shall be very happy to supply it.”

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“May I ask, Sir, whether any portion of this money will go to the local boards of Malabar?”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“Sir, I am sorry I have to oppose this grant. The hon. the Home Member was telling us what the position was. He told us that Rs. 11,00,000 were expected in the way of fines from those who were convicted in Malabar, of which amount Rs. 2,00,000 have been collected up to date, and that the collection of the balance of Rs. 9,00,000 is to be anticipated now and utilized for the purpose of giving compensation. He said that this compensation is to be given not by grants of money at once but by writing off Rs. 9,00,000 which have been advanced already. Well, Sir, it is rather difficult for me to see the urgency of the case. The money has been advanced already in the shape of loans to those who were suffering, and those people tided over their difficulties and now probably they have got a prosperous year. I do not see the urgency of anticipating the collection of such a large amount as Rs. 9,00,000 in the shape of fines; and it has also been said that the fines are to be collected in dribblets. I do not know if it can be seriously contended in a case like this when Rs. 9,00,000 are to

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

be collected in dribblets, that the whole amount can be collected. I think it is a very serious speculation. It was also said that many of these loans were going to mature this year and that we should have to tell the people whether we are going to collect them or not. I think there is an easy way of meeting the difficulty. The people may be told that the Government are not going to collect the money this year. Whether the loan itself is going to be written off or not may be decided when we collect the remaining Rs. 9,00,000. We are going to make these recoveries from the fines, and when the money is on hand, we can tell the people that we are writing off the whole amount, and until we can so write off the whole, we can tell them 'You can wait and see.' That is a position which will not in any way seriously interfere with the convenience of those who have received loans. Nothing need be collected from them this year and they may be told that nothing will be collected next year.

"Then the hon. the Home Member said that at his instance a committee was constituted in Malabar to decide what ought to be given to the people. That appears to me, Sir, a very strange proceeding. The Council has not yet decided what amount it is prepared to give, and it is only after that that a committee can be appointed to go into the matter of distribution. Instead of doing so, the hon. Member appoints a committee and says that the committee is waiting to know our decision and as soon as it receives that decision it will distribute the money. If the distribution is to depend on the vote of this Council, I think the committee will have to follow the decision of the Council and not to precede it. So, it seems to me a strange procedure to appoint this committee in the way in which it has been appointed, and the appointment of the committee does not in any way show any urgency in dealing with this matter. So far as I am concerned, it seems to me that from the case as put forward by the hon. the Home Member himself, this is not an urgent matter at all, and that it ought to await the final realization of the fines that have been imposed.

"There is another complication in the matter. The claim, the hon. the Home Member himself admitted, is not a legal claim, and that it is out of grace that the Government want to help these people. By no means have we seen the end of these claims for compensation. The amounts have been given as loans to certain people who applied for them. There are a number of people, public servants and others who have laid claim for compensation in this connexion. I was told, Sir—I speak subject to correction—that the claims of adhikaris and other people who are serving the Government, alone come to about Rs. 20,00,000."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"On a point of personal explanation, Sir, I may say that I think the figure I gave the hon. Member was a little more than Rs. 4,00,000."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"And there are others, quite a large number of people who have not laid their claims before the Government and we do not really know what the extent of the claims will be. Before we distribute the money we ought to be in a position to know what are all the claims and how we are going to distribute the amount so as to meet them. In the course of the discussion it was suggested, that the claims . . ."

2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" May I know, Sir, which discussion the hon. Member is referring to ? "

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" I am referring, Sir, to the discussion in the Finance Committee, and in the course of that discussion it was suggested that the claims might amount to a large figure. The claim on behalf of the Malabar District Board alone, to set right roads and bridges, came to 3 or 4 lakhs. There were several claims like that and it was said that we could not really know what the total amount under this head was going to be. It might be Rs. 20,00,000 or it might be more, or it might be less. That is how we stand."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TUDHUR :—" May I explain for a moment, Sir ? The figure Rs. 20,00,000 includes the present amount of Rs. 10,00,000, as also the claims of adhikaris and others. It is not in addition to this grant now asked for."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" That is what I am saying. So, the whole claim may come up to Rs. 20,00,000 or more or less. But we shall have actually these Rs. 11,00,000 to distribute among all the claimants. If you are going to anticipate the Rs. 9,00,000 and write off the whole amount of the loan now, what are you going to do with the other claims which may come in ?

11-30 a.m. " We can only distribute the amounts available among all the claimants. We cannot anticipate and write off the amount to the extent of Rs. 9 lakhs and tell the other people that we have already done this and that we are not going to pay any further compensation. Is this not the position that we are asked to take on the matter ? The hon. the Home Member himself has stated that a committee is going to sit or is sitting already. Supposing a larger number of applications for compensation are put forward and the committee think that a large amount is necessary, what are you going to do ? Are you going to say that the Rs. 9 lakhs anticipated have already been written off and that we have no funds or is the hon. the Home Member going to come and say to the House ' you have already sanctioned this grant and so you ought to sanction another 9 lakhs ? ' That being the position, Sir, I think it is a little premature to dispose of this question at the present moment. The proper course for the disposal of this question will be when we have realized all the fines or when we have collected whatever we have been able to realize, to distribute the amounts realized among all the claimants that come forward. As I said, there is absolutely no urgency about the matter. The people who suffered during the rebellion have got over the difficulty, and why should we go out of the way and write off all those loans, when we have for that purpose to anticipate to realize a collection of 9 lakhs in dribblets in two years. On this ground, I think we cannot pass the grant as put forward. I have been given some details in the Finance Committee as usual, and we were also told that out of the 9 lakhs so distributed about Rs. 4½ lakhs were distributed in small amounts of Rs. 100 and less to small owners. Probably in their case the Council may agree to write off the loans. But with regard to the remaining items some sort of discretion will have to be used whether the whole of the amount should be written off or only a portion of this class only should be written off. This is a matter which will have to be gone into after

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

the realization of the fines and after ascertaining the number of claimants for damages. Sir, it is not a case which we can dispose of at the present moment; there is no hurry about it; and there are a lot of things of a very complicated character to be settled before we can finally dispose of it. For these reasons, I would earnestly request the hon. the Home Member to consider whether he might not drop this demand at the present moment; but if he chooses to press it, I for one will have to vote against it. I may also say that the Finance Committee was equally divided when this question was discussed."

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—"As the hon. the Home Member himself said, this matter seems to be rather a complicated one. But after the information supplied by him and after it has been supplemented by the hon. Member who was in the Finance Committee, I understand the position of the Government with regard to this supplementary grant is something like this: fines to the extent of about Rs. 11 lakhs have been levied upon those who misbehaved during the rebellion and out of this amount Rs. 2 lakhs have been collected and Government hope to collect the balance of Rs. 9 lakhs in the course of the next two years. In the meantime, I understand that Government have given by way of loans an amount to the extent of Rs. 9 lakhs, which I suppose have been distributed among the various people who suffered during the rebellion. And if I have understood the hon. the Home Member correctly, the supplementary grant that he now asks the House to vote is for the purpose of writing off these loans of Rs. 9 lakhs that have been granted to the sufferers in the rebellion. So far, Sir, I think I have understood him correctly. But I could not understand the next thing he said. He stated that he had appointed a committee which was investigating into the matter of how compensation was to be given to others, and he asked us to give this sum of Rs. 10 lakhs for the purpose. Now, if, as he suggested in the first portion of his speech, Rs. 9 lakhs out of this Rs. 10 lakhs are simply for writing off the loans already granted, is the committee appointed by the Home Member only to find out the ways and means of distributing this Rs. 1 lakh or is he going to say to this House that 'the committee I have appointed wants another 10 lakhs to relieve the sufferings of other people' and ask for a supplementary grant of Rs. 10 lakhs? That is a point which I cannot understand. Moreover, when he tells us that Rs. 9 lakhs have for the present been advanced in the shape of loans to sufferers, one would naturally like to know the classification of sufferers to whom these loans have been advanced. No doubt, as the hon. the Home Member himself pointed out, the Government is under no obligation to compensate people who suffered in rebellions like this. But in giving any sort of compensation at all, I have no doubt the House will agree with me when I say that we must make a differentiation between the class of people who do deserve compensation and a certain other class who can afford to put up with such losses and who do not deserve compensation from our hands; so that out of Rs. 9 lakhs distributed as loans, if I have understood my hon. friend Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar correctly, an amount to the extent of Rs. 4 lakhs has been distributed in small loans of Rs. 100 and less, and evidently the other Rs. 5 lakhs must have been distributed in big sums. If these Rs. 5 lakhs have been distributed in big sums, I would not be making an extravagant demand if I asked whether before writing off

2nd February 1923] [Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar]

Grant XXXII—cont.

these Rs. 5 lakhs we are not entitled to know the class of persons who have taken those Rs. 5 lakhs of loans ('Hear, hear' from Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai) and whether it will not be proper for us to insist on the return of those loans treating them simply as a temporary relief, unless we find that they are also entitled to be excused them. So, I, for one, am not in a position to say from the information supplied by the hon. the Home Member whether Government will be justified, and whether this House will be justified in allowing Government to write off the whole amount of Rs. 9 lakhs as it stands. Even if we had the information, I do not see any reason why these Rs. 10 lakhs should be written off at present. As the Home Member has said, he has every hope of realizing Rs. 9 lakhs that are outstanding as fines to be collected. If the loans that have now been granted have been granted on the distinct understanding that they will not be free from interest for more than one year, I do not see any objection for Government to extending that time of grace for another year and to wait and see how much of the Rs. 9 lakhs will be collected and then come to this House and ask to vote for a certain amount of money for writing off loans. In these circumstances, Sir, I think I am justified in requesting the hon. the Home Member not to ask this House at the present stage to vote for this supplementary grant."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Sir, it has been stated before the House that loans to the extent of Rs. 9 lakhs have already been made to those who suffered in the Mappilla rebellion. Out of those who received those loans there must be poor persons and rich persons. Some months ago, I interpellated the Government on this subject—I speak subject to correction as I do not remember the exact figure now and I did not expect this discussion to come on now—and my recollection is that in answer to my question the Government said that about Rs. 3 lakhs or so roughly—I am speaking in round numbers—were given till then to rubber plantation companies and other companies as loans and other amounts to other persons. With reference to the loans that have been granted to poor persons, the hon. Mr. Knapp suggested that they should be written off and treated as grants. I think that is based on a sound principle. I would suggest that loans of Rs. 100 or Rs. 150 and less might thus be written off and might be converted into grants. But I believe, as my friends who preceded me have stated, there is no need now to convert the other loans into grants and to write them off. The hon. the Home Member himself stated that a fine of Rs. 11 lakhs have been levied on the Mappilla prisoners, that Rs. 2 lakhs have already been collected and that the Government expect to collect Rs. 9 lakhs. It is quite possible that the Government's anticipations may not be realized. However, the Government now hope to realize an yield of Rs. 9 lakhs from the remaining fines. So, the time for considering whether those small loans up to a limit of Rs. 100 should be written off and converted into grants will properly arise only after the Government are in a position to state that they have realized the whole of the Rs. 9 lakhs or that they were able to realize only so much and are unable to realize the remainder. It is only when the whole of the anticipated fines are either collected, or after they have found that they are not able to collect some portion of them, that the time for converting these loans into grants will arise. So far as that goes, all the hon. Members will agree that this demand is premature."

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

[2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

"Then, we have to consider the larger loans of more than Rs. 100. In the case of those persons who have received larger sums as loans, I think—I am speaking subject to correction because full materials are not before the House—they must be in a position to repay these loans, or in any case portions of them. I believe in the case of those companies, which were referred to in the answer by the Government to my question, there must be at any rate some companies which may be in a position to repay the amount. So also other rich persons, such as rich private individuals and agriculturists who have received comparatively large loans, must be able to repay them. In the case of the companies, it is quite possible that some of them have insured their estates, and in that case it will be possible for them to realize the whole or in any case a portion of the amount lost from the insurance companies. With reference to this question of Rs. 9 lakhs, the committee that has already been appointed by the Government with Mr. Macmichael as President might legitimately and reasonably and properly be asked to go into the details and make a report to the Government.

"It is only after all these details have been settled—viz., whether private individuals who have received large grants are able to repay the whole or part of their amount and whether the companies are going to repay their amount or whether all or any of those are in a position to deserve compensation for any portion of the damages they have suffered and have been furnished to the House,—that it will be in a position to say whether it is necessary to write off the loans and convert them into grants. My hon. friend, the hon. the Home Member, has stated that a committee has already been appointed to consider this, and that, in addition to the 9 lakhs that have been granted, it will be necessary hereafter to give some loans to persons who are non-agriculturists and who have not yet come forward with their claims."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I did not say 'loans'. I said 'grants'."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"There are non-agricultural persons who till now, though the rebellion which began in August 1921 ended early last year, have not come forward with any claims. . . ."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I did not say that they have not applied for grants. They put in their claims for compensation many months ago."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"It seems that they have applied for grants, but that they have not yet been granted. If that is the case, where is the necessity now for this grant, before the fines have been collected and before the Budget is introduced at the end of this month. I submit there is no need whatever to vote for any amount for this purpose. My friend further stated that there was the question of damages. Reparation for damages is a very legitimate idea no doubt. But here again no materials are placed before us and, as Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar said, I do not blame the Government for appointing a committee to consider this question. What I suggest is this: Let this committee make a report saying what amount, either accurate or probable, will be necessary to be granted to persons whose buildings have been destroyed. Let us know where we stand. Let us know what amount will be necessary to grant on account of this rebellion. Let us know from the committee headed by Mr. Macmichael

2nd February 1923]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

Grant XXXII—cont.

what amount will be necessary for payment to companies, what amount is likely to be obtained from the insurance companies, and all that. Let us know also what amount of fines the Government have been so far able to collect. When we are in possession of all these facts, we can proceed to consider this grant. So far as I am able to understand, the Government are granting compensation to the poor people in Malabar and it is necessary to wipe off loans already granted. As it is stated that the loans have been granted with interest for one year, where is the necessity to remit them now? It may be a great hardship. In any case, so far as the present demand is concerned, I submit, it is premature and that the House should not proceed to consider it. I do not say that this demand need not be granted when the proper time comes. That would depend upon the circumstances prevalent then. Therefore, I suggest to my hon. friend, the Home Member, that this demand may be postponed until all the details absolutely necessary for coming to a correct conclusion are furnished to the House. But if the Home Member proceeds to press his demand then, it is my humble opinion that the proper course for the House would be to reject it."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, I must oppose the present motion for the supplementary grant. Before offering any remarks further, I must take exception to the way in which these demands are sprung upon the House without notice. I take it, Sir, that the hon. the Home Member was aware that this demand should be applied for long long ago; if so, I fail to see why he should have delayed his application and put it before us to-day without any notice whatsoever. That is one thing which I want to say at the outset.

"Another thing is that the hon. the Home Member has not placed the House in full possession of facts to enable it to judge whether this grant should be granted or not. For example, my Muhammadan colleagues would like to know how this amount, if granted, will be distributed among the sufferers there. Will it be restricted altogether to the Hindu sufferers or will it be given to the Mappilas also or will the Muhammadan brethren be denied any help on the ground of alleged disloyalty, etc.?"

"My friend, Mr. Krishnan Nayar, referred to certain companies which might not be in need of this help. That is a point about which we should like to have more information. Are the companies really in need of this help? Can they not meet the loss they have sustained otherwise? That is a thing which we have to ponder over. I may say for the information of the Government that there have been for a long time past ugly rumours to the effect that certain companies in which very influential people have certain interests were going to be benefited out of the State money. I am not able at present to make myself responsible for the accuracy of those rumours, but anyhow I think the Government will be well advised if they do not proceed further with this application for grant. Give enough time for the Council to think over this matter, place the House in full possession of relevant facts and then press for the application of this grant.

"As regards the poorer people, I do not think the House will stand in the way of any grant being given to them. I do not know, under what provision, loans to poor agriculturists—loans under Rs. 100—have been granted. If they have been granted under the Agricultural Loans Act, I think the

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

Government have power under that Act to remit the collection of the amounts altogether or to suspend the collection for some time longer. So, I do not see where any urgency comes in, in the case of such loans and if it is for the Rubber companies, I should say that they are rich enough to afford to take the money, if finally sanctioned, some time later. Looked at from any point of view, I think the motion before the House is very premature and I would appeal to the hon. the Home Member not to proceed further with his application."

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—"Sir, as one who did some little service immediately after the troubles in Malabar were over and as one who went and visited the affected houses and temples. I feel it my duty to vote against this grant. For, I found during my inquiry that there were conflicting interests set up by different bodies and there were a number of societies and groups of people, some recognized and some discredited, holding inquiries. Again there is the fact that the Servants of India Society headed by Mr. Devadas has been collecting large sums of money and the whole amount has not yet been spent: there is a certain amount still remaining that is set apart for relief in Malabar. The Government themselves had not made up their mind as to the exact scope and nature of the relief to be given at the time when I was there. The hon. the Home Member was pleased to say that one of the institutions which obtained some relief was a Hindu temple. I visited two or three Hindu temples which were entered into and desecrated during the rebellion and I know the nature of the damage that was done. In many cases it was not of any substantial character if you think of brick and mortar, but if you think of the sentiment, no value can be placed upon the desecration if it is understood what it is to repair a temple into a fitting condition once it is desecrated. It depends upon the length of the purse of the temple authorities. A sum of ten lakhs was spent on one single institution some years ago. This is a matter in which one has to be very delicate and it requires more inquiry and judicious adjustment of our resources rather than searching round the various fields where relief must be given. It is not a matter to be inquired into by Government officials or by Government committees but one to be entrusted to local philanthropic associations who have made it their avowed duty to render social service and assistance. I therefore think that, before we can do anything in the matter, we must be in a position to know what exactly the condition of things is. I request the hon. the Home Member to place before the House all the papers connected with this matter and to entrust the inquiry to non-official people who are already doing their duty. We do not want anybody from outside to be imported, we want that they should be neither Mappillas nor Malayalis, but those who are there, who have seen things done and who could be expected to approach this difficult task with some degree of impartiality."

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI :—"Sir, the discussion that has now taken place provokes me to call for information on one or two points. It is said that about 4½ lakhs have been distributed among rich people. I want to know what is the total number of those who have appropriated these 4½ lakhs and what is the highest amount of grant that has been made out of this sum."

2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—“Sir, I rise to oppose this supplementary demand, and in doing so, I wish to draw the attention of
12 noon.

the House to one or two principal aspects of the matter. So far as my information goes, the number of private individuals to whom loans have been granted is 17,000 and if we take the total amount given to them, it seems to work out an average of Rs. 25 per head. With respect to the other $4\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs that seems to have been advanced to large concerns, planting concerns and others, the question arises, if all these loans are now sought to be converted into gratuitous relief, why was not gratuitous relief admitted as the principal policy at the time when the crisis in Malabar was at its highest and distress at its worst? In those days, in spite of many representations made, the Government sternly discountenanced the idea of gratuitous relief and left it entirely to private philanthropic agencies. The Government undertook to grant only loans and they were of two kinds: the first was loan *with* interest to the Mappillas and the second was *without* interest to non-Mappillas. One of the questions that arises is, are also the Mappillas to whom loans were given to be benefited by this, or is this amount asked for solely to benefit those to whom loans were granted without interest?

“With respect to the industrial concerns, it seems to me that the market conditions to-day are much better than they were when these loans were granted. The price of rubber and I believe that of tea also have gone up and therefore those industrial concerns ought to be in a position to face the situation much better to-day than they were when they received loans. If at the time of distress, the Government felt that it was not gratuitous relief that ought to be given but loans, what has made them reconsider the situation to-day and come forward at a time when the market conditions are good with a proposal that these loans must be written off and converted into gratuitous relief? This is the big question of principle which I should like to place before this House. Had only the Government realized long ago that it was gratuitous relief that ought to be given, then I am quite sure a larger number of applications would have been made for relief. More people would have approached the Government for help. Having adopted the policy which acted as a deterrent on the number of applications and which only enabled the better and well-to-do class of people to take advantage of it, now to turn round and say that we should adopt the principle of poor relief seems to me to be a grievous insult and injury to Malabar. I do not wish to pursue this aspect of the question, but I should like to have more information than what has been given so far by the hon. the Home Member. Many of the hon. Members have already mentioned a number of items on which information is lacking.

“Finally, I would say that I agree with the Government in saying that compensation as a principle, as a claim or as a right does not arise. I would prefer that at this time of the day after things have begun to settle down we stuck fast to the principle rather than go back upon it and revise it in a manner which, as I just now mentioned, is objectionable from so many points of view. The Government have started on the assumption of giving loans and they should stick to it. Again, I do not like the idea that the anticipated income from the fines imposed upon the Mappilla prisoners should be in any way connected with the question of compensation. Sir, a great deal

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

may be said on the abstract theory whether the culprit should not be made to pay reparations, damages, or indemnity, or whatever term you like to call it by, to the fullest possible extent. It is not an abstract theory that this Council should discuss. The Council has to see whether it is a wise measure, whether it is a prudential measure, and what will be the consequence of it. The consequence will be that one set of people in Malabar will depend on what fines can be collected from another set of people for getting relief and in lieu of the grants they asked for. By this measure you would be fanning the dying embers in Malabar and for years and years together it would be the interest of non-Mappillas there to see that every drop of blood that could possibly be squeezed is squeezed out from the Mappillas. Now I ask, whatever may be the logic of it and whatever may be its justification as an abstract theory, is that the way in which a Government which wants to compose differences, to heal sore wounds and to set the feet of Malabar once again on the path of peace and progress, should proceed? I feel greatly distressed to take part in this discussion, but it is with no light heart that I rise to oppose this demand. Rather than this demand should be thrown out by this House, I would request the hon. the Home Member whether he could not see his way to withdraw it for the present and to go into the question once again more carefully and see whether a more satisfactory solution may not be arrived at."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I am sorry to say that if this demand is not withdrawn, I have to join with those who opposed it. In the first place, looking at the language of the application for grant and comparing it with what has been stated by the hon. the Home Member as to the real circumstance of the case, I am afraid that the application is made in language which is not quite accurate. It is stated that the Government should be granted an additional sum of Rs. 10 lakhs under '47. Miscellaneous—Miscellaneous and unforeseen charges—' on account of compensation to be made for losses sustained during the recent Mappilla rebellion in Malabar. I gather from what has been stated by the hon. the Home Member that nearly nine lakhs out of the ten lakhs asked for have already been distributed. It is only the remaining one lakh together with a sum of 1½ or two lakhs that may be collected in the shape of fines which may have again to be distributed: so that the whole ten lakhs asked for is not intended for distribution. Strictly speaking, the language is not accurate unless it is sought to justify it on the ground that what has been hitherto given was loan and what is hereafter intended to be done is to convert these loans into free gifts. So much as to the language.

"Then coming to the supplementary demand, as far as I understood the hon. the Home Member, he said that what he asked the House was to permit the sum of ten lakhs shown in the loan budget to be converted into a revenue head. It amounts to saying that in respect of what was given from monies borrowed from the Government of India for the purpose of lending to the sufferers in Malabar, let us now pay this money out of the revenues of our province. The Government of India stood as creditor for the recovery of these monies till now from those tenants and the Provincial Government was in the position of a guarantor. Now it is sought to give the monies from the provincial revenues: so that the loan which was obtained from the Government of India will be repaid and the Local Government will convert itself

2nd February 1923] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiayar]

Grant XXXII—cont.

into a creditor of these persons who have taken loan and look to the fines that have been imposed for the repayment of the loans. Optimistic officers in Malabar feel that they will be able to collect in course of time all the fines imposed on the Mappillas. We are now asked by this demand to pay out of provincial revenue what we have allowed to be given by way of relief from loan funds.

“While things are taking such a course, and while the Government are trying to give away such large sums of money by way of gift to the sufferers in Malabar, well may my hon. friends Messrs. Ranganatha Mudaliyar and Sivasankaram Pillai ask why should not the claims of Bellary and Kurnool which have long been suffering from the ravages of famine be considered and relief extended to them? It is well that they should ask for relief because the Government are dealing with provincial revenues which have been derived from the ratepayers and the taxpayers throughout the Presidency.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“The money in question was not derived from the ratepayers and the taxpayers in the Presidency, but is collected from the Mappillas who were convicted of offences.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“May I remind the hon. the Home Member that the expenditure for the martial law courts and for a lot of other items was incurred from the provincial revenues?”

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“So, Sir, we are asked to make ourselves responsible for this loan and make ourselves the principal creditors instead of the Government of India in the belief that the disorderly people who have been sent to gaol and who have been let out will keep their promise and be able to pay the fines imposed upon them. Indeed, that is a very slender thread on which to hang our hopes.”

“Then, Sir, another question arises and it is this. Is it proper for us to decide, while we are at the fag end of the session, the question of principle involved in this demand, namely, when riots and disorders or rebellion break out whether the Government stands in the position of insurers of its subjects against the loss which they may sustain or whether their duty is only to alleviate distress to a certain extent not by free gifts but by some financial assistance at the time of distress, such assistance being repayable in times of plenty? Such a question I raised a year ago in the Finance Committee when applications for relief were made on behalf of officers who lost their all including their kith and kin. Indeed, such pathetic cases might be dealt with sympathetically, but only we wanted to know the exact amount of liability which the State would be called upon to meet. After proper information was collected, we were only prepared to give them a grant of a loan. That principle has always been recognized, but it is now sought to get the sanction of this Council not to recognize the well-defined principle of giving relief in the shape of loans, but to countenance that of free gifts.”

“I understand that a committee is investigating the matter of giving relief in Malabar and, before we have exact information as to our total liabilities, we are called upon to accede to a grant of 10 lakhs. By giving our assent to this demand of 10 lakhs we might find ourselves committed to a principle which we cannot go back upon and which we cannot help applying when the full liability shall have been ascertained. For aught we know, our full liability may be 40 lakhs or 50 lakhs or it may even go to 100 lakhs.”

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

“Again, Sir, it is said that the fines which have been collected from the Mappillas ought to be applied to those who have suffered and to whom we have promised reliefs. True, has not the Government itself incurred a good many charges on account of the Mappilla outbreak? What about the 4·20 lakhs which the Council sanctioned the other day for increase in the jail accommodation on account of the increase in the jail population? What about the Law and Order departments which have been strengthened on account of this Mappilla rebellion? Not that I am wanting in sympathy with the people in Malabar, but that I do want that, before we take a step, we should count the cost thereof and we should have a regulated system by which we can ascertain the total amount of our liability and the respective or the comparative claims of individuals for assistance. Let us not give relief to those who have borrowed on the footing that they will in course of time be able to repay the loan.

“It was also stated that this additional sum of one lakh was intended to give relief to those who had not asked for it. Yes, they have not asked for it in the shape of loans, but I gather from the hon. the Home Member's remarks that they have asked for it in the shape of compensation. That means they honestly realize that they will not be able to repay what they get and therefore they ask for it as a free gift. So, to those who feel that they are in a better position to repay in course of time, you say what you have given is a free gift and you say the same thing also to those who have the sense of honesty to say that they are not able to repay the loan. We do not know to what extent the amount will be utilized for the relief of the officers who have asked. Now, Sir, having regard to the fact that such relief as has been asked for has already been given and therefore there is no distress which requires to be remedied at the present moment, this grant seems to me to be unnecessary and can be brought forward again when a full discussion of the total liability of the Government is ascertained and when it is finally decided how far relief should be given to all the claimants. Till that time, I think the consideration of this demand should be postponed. Under these circumstances, I appeal to the House to reject this demand if it is not withdrawn.”

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR :—“May I ask the hon. the Home Member who it was that distributed the loans at the time of granting loans, whether they were distributed by Government officers or whether they were distributed by a committee? That the loans that were granted to poor people should be written off and that grants to landlords should be recovered seem to me to be unreasonable. Such a distinction between the two is not advisable. If poor people are unable to pay their debts, more time should be allowed for them to pay off their debts. The loans that have been given to them should remain as loans and not as grants.”

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—“Sir, the proposal is to write off some loans advanced to certain class of sufferers in the Mappilla outbreak in Malabar and to provide funds to enable the Government to award compensation for certain other class of sufferers. If I understand the hon. the Home Member correctly a sum of 4½ lakhs has been already disbursed among 17,000 odd people on loans of Rs. 100 and smaller denominations to help them to set up in life after the disturbance. Evidently these are poor people and no

2nd February 1923] [Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan]

Grant XXXII—cont.

body can have the least objection to write off these loans. I take it that loans of larger denominations must have been given to landholders, planters and other people who are better off and therefore stand on a different footing altogether. No doubt, the planters have suffered a good deal; but I am distinctly of opinion that the loans that were given to them were all they could legitimately hope to get if there was no legal obligation on the part of the Government to compensate for damages caused in the rebellion. They do not deserve any grant or compensation especially in view of the fact that recently the value of coffee, rubber and tea has very much increased. The other richer class of people, the landholders for instance, can have no cause for complaint and must be satisfied if the Government have given them loans to tide over their difficulties. The landholders do not want anything at the hands of the Government done as an 'act of grace'. We have heard that phrase repeated more than once."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Does my hon. friend say that as representing the landlords of Malabar?"

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN:—"Yes, Sir, I am speaking on behalf of the jennies, my constituents. I had occasion to consult several of them and they still hold that Government are under legal obligation to compensate them for losses suffered in the rebellion. They do not want anything as an 'act of grace' and further the policy of showing kindness and grace is not in keeping with the treatment hitherto accorded to them. The assessments on estates looted and destroyed by the rebels, and on fields that were harvested by them have all been recovered by coercive process and the authorities were not pleased even to grant an extension of time to pay up these dues. That, Sir, was the sort of rigorous treatment accorded to the landholders living in the rebel area.

"There is yet another class of people who deserve very kind treatment, I mean the owners and *Uralans* of temples that were destroyed during the rebellion. The Mappilla considers the mosque sacrosanct while he thinks he can desecrate the Hindu temples with impunity. That is a mentality I can hardly understand. There are hundreds of temples that were pulled down and whose idols were broken. Full compensation for rebuilding and purifying such temples has to be given and the money for the purpose has to be found from the fines levied from the Mappillas or from other sources. I have strong feelings on this matter. These are the observations which I wish to make."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"The discussion which has so far proceeded must have reminded the hon. Members of this House that there is keen difference of opinion regarding this grant and I shall only put it to the hon. the Home Member whether he thinks it worth while to press his motion at this stage in the absence of complete information and when we are expecting a very complete statement about the financial prospects at the end of this month. It is a matter for serious consideration as to whether it is a correct principle to mix up the question of the levy of fines with the question of compensation to be granted to sufferers; and I am inclined to agree with Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi in his view that there should not be any such connexion established between the two. It is again a matter for serious consideration whether, when once the Government have

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

embarked upon a policy of giving loans, it is correct that we should depart from that principle without taking all possible steps for their recovery. If the terms originally granted for their recovery and the instalments granted are not sufficient for the purpose of recovering them, it is quite desirable that the terms are altered, and further instalments and better facilities are given for the payment of these loans. I think it will be creating a very unwholesome precedent if, after once starting the principle of giving loans, we go back upon that principle and write off those loans and practically convert them into grants. More than that, I should think that if the Government upon a further investigation finds—of course it is proposed to appoint a committee—that it is absolutely desirable to give relief to the poorer people among the sufferers, they may come before the House with a demand for supplementary grant. To ask this House to vote at the present stage with imperfect materials is very unreasonable.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, this grant is undoubtedly one of great complexity, as has been remarked by the hon. the mover. This complexity has still further increased by the fact that by way of information no papers or other materials have been furnished to the Members of this House before this grant had been tabled for discussion. I have many times complained in this House, absolutely without any effect, that when an important matter such as this is under discussion, the procedure for the Government should be a procedure of previous publication of the papers on the subject. I may illustrate the difficulty in dealing with matters such as this. My hon. friend, Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi, said that the total number of persons to whom loan was granted was according to his information 17,000. I should like to know where he got this information from. So far as I know I have not been furnished with any papers on the subject either before this debate or by means of the papers placed on the Editors’ table. Sir, several statements have also been made that relief by way of loans was granted to various persons and several of them are persons whose income or whose properties were worth Rs. 50 or Rs. 100, or that the amount of loan was . . . ”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ What I suggested was that loans to the extent of Rs. 100 or Rs. 150, should be remitted, because a portion of 10 lakhs of rupees which were distributed as loans had been covered by loans of Rs. 100 and Rs. 150.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Even on that subject we have not been supplied with any information or papers. Then, Sir, statements have been made on other subjects without notice, and we are told that a large portion of these nine lakhs or ten lakhs of rupees was given to rubber companies and plantations as loans. No information has been placed before this House as to whether any of these persons received loans, and if so, under what terms they were granted them, and under what particular circumstances we are asked to remit those amounts. I wish, in concluding this portion of my remarks, again to submit that if my hon. friend who moves a grant of this character merely says that he wishes to remit ten lakhs of rupees, certainly he will not get any support. In these circumstances, when all the facts I have mentioned have not been placed before us and when we are asked to give our assent to a demand of this character, it seems to me that my hon. friend is not at all treating us with

2nd February 1923] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

Grant XXXII—cont.

courtesy. Having stated that, I must endorse everything that has been said by my hon. friend, Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. If we are taking an attitude of hostility to this proposal, it is certainly not for want of sympathy with the sufferers of Malabar. I may say that we have every sympathy with them, but when my hon. friend opposite comes to us without any information and asks us to write off ten lakhs of rupees, it seems to me that we shall not be discharging our duty unless we make some attempt to satisfy ourselves whether my hon. friend is right.

"There is only one other aspect of this question. I need not repeat any arguments that have already been advanced. I have some dim recollection of having seen on the agenda of this Council some resolution asking for the appointment of a committee to find out ways and means for the compensation to be given to the sufferers in Malabar. I find on inquiry that notice of this resolution was given on the 18th August 1922 and this resolution has been of course blocked up on account of the overwhelming business of the hon. friend and his colleagues which had to be transacted in priority to the non-official business. The resolution purported not only to appoint a committee but also to decide exactly, in terms of that resolution, to consider to what sort of sufferers compensation should be granted and to record a finding on that matter. This matter has not been gone into and my hon. friend comes forward to take up the whole question and to write off the amount which was once distributed. I ask my hon. friend why, after having seen this resolution in the name of my friend, Mr. Prabhakaran Tampan, he did not think of appointing a committee either of this House or of persons who have an intimate knowledge of Malabar like my hon. friend Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar to go into this very question. If this matter had been put through, I am sure hon. Members would have been in a better position from the fullness of their report.

"Finally my friend said that Mr. Macmichael was looking into the Malabar affairs. I am certain that in connexion with this matter the local officers must have sent a number of reports as to how these loans were distributed, the classes of persons who received relief and the grounds on which the present request for writing off this amount was put forward, and if all these reports had been placed before us, and if my friend had only asked us for the grant in the light of such information, there would have been no difficulty in getting our assent. In the absence of such information, we have no other alternative but to reject this proposal in the circumstances which have transpired.

"In conclusion, I only wish to repeat that whatever we may say here, no impression should be created abroad that we are not willing to give relief to the sufferers of Malabar and I am certain that my hon. friend will devise ways and means for what has been done or is proposed to be done."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Sir, may I, in the first place, apologize to the House and to the hon. Mr. Ramachandra Rao for what, I admit, was rather short notice given in this case?"

I was accused of holding this matter up without bringing it to the notice of this House, but that is not so. It was placed before the Finance Committee last Saturday, but the Finance Committee were unfortunately unable to make up their minds regarding it and left me in uncertainty as to how to proceed.

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

The interval between that and this is not, I think, very long, and I cannot be accused of delay. I sent in the notice yesterday, partly, as I explained, because it is urgent, and partly under the impression that there will be no opportunity for bringing forward this supplementary grant during the budget session, I thought it desirable to get it through this session. But I did not expect that it would be coming on this morning.

“Now, Sir, I am told by the hon. Member behind that I have been discourteous to this House because I have appointed a committee to consider this question.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“I said a committee for distribution, Sir.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“Not for distribution, Sir, but a committee to consider the whole question on the other hand. I am accused by Mr. Ramachandra Rao of having been discourteous to the Members of this House in not taking notice of a resolution asking for the appointment of such a committee. As a matter of fact, Sir, I had taken steps, but I could not get a committee actually appointed; for, as I explained to the House at the outset, there is no use in appointing a committee unless we have some kind of idea of the money we are going to allocate. There is no use asking a committee to sit on the matter and deal with the details without any idea of the money that will be available.

“Now, Sir, I must admit that when I came to this House this morning, I did so in the assumption that in one respect there was going to be no difficulty. I assumed, and I think I was quite justified in so assuming, that this House was not going totally to repudiate the undertaking which the Government gave, and although we are under no legal obligation to give compensation, I thought they would recognize the amount of suffering in Malabar and would allocate for the purpose of relieving the sufferers at least such money as might be realized by way of fines. I did not suppose, Sir, that the House was going to repudiate that. But, Sir, if the House is going to repudiate it,—and this, I take it, has been the trend of all the speeches—then I say that the assurance of deep sympathy for the sufferings in Malabar which came from the hon. Mr. Ramachandra Rao and the hon. Member behind, is worth very little. Whether the policy, which to my mind is an entirely proper one, is right or not, is a different matter. I say I came to the House with the assumption that that policy was not going to be repudiated. I am free to confess, Sir, my surprise at the point which Mr. Ramalingam Chettiayar raised whether people should not be called to pay up their loans and whether Government should not keep its share of the fines.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“That is not what I said, Sir. The whole argument of mine was that we ought to know what we were going to collect by way of fines and then distribute. That was what I said.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“Mr. Ramalingam Chettiayar raised the question whether there were not demands on behalf of Government servants and others which ought also to come out of this amount.”

2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII—cont.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"When the hon. the Home Member said that it was not provincial revenue, I said, Sir, that it was provincial revenue so far as it bore expenditure with regard to the province things general. I said that we ought to calculate what we were going to collect by means of fines before distributing it. That was the whole gist of my argument from the beginning. When it was said by the hon. the Home Member that it was not provincial revenue and that it was coming from some other source, I said it was provincial revenue; the provincial revenue was contributing for all sorts of expenditure and so the fine was provincial revenue."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"I am glad that there is at least one Member who does not desire to repudiate the promise made by the Government.

"Now, Sir, there is one point in connexion with this matter of which apparently no hon. Member at present is fully informed. There has been a certain amount of discussion as to the principle of using fines for the purpose of compensating sufferers. Under the Mappilla Act we have a provision for fines. The fine under the Mappilla Act is leviable from the whole Mappilla area, and however loyal a Mappilla may be, he is equally liable with his guilty neighbour to pay that fine. That system of fining is likely to cause a good deal of annoyance and discontent and it was partly on that account that, when we found that there were many thousands of people to be prosecuted, we came to the conclusion that if fines were imposed and recovered from them, this would probably be a way of escaping the imposition of a Mappilla Act fine for which I may say very large number of Hindus had been clamouring from the very beginning. Thus, Sir, as regards the principle of compensating sufferers out of the fines imposed on the Mappillas, the Mappilla Act recognizes it and it lays down that when fines have been collected under the Act, the first call on these fines is for compensation to those who have suffered. So far as the principle is concerned, therefore, Sir, we are not starting a new one. We are only proposing to apply a principle which has been in force for the last sixty years.

"Then Dr. Rama Rao (I don't see him in his place now) raised the question whether we propose to pay any enormous cost for the purpose of removing the pollution of some of the Hindu temples. So far as I know, that is not contemplated. The committee has been appointed to tackle the question only with reference to the material loss sustained by the temples.

"Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi in dealing with the whole question of principle regarding these fines made a remark which was of interest. He complained that by making the payment of compensation depend on the recovery of the fines from the Mappillas we would be keeping open the wound which we are all anxious to see healed. But, Sir, it seems to me that in coming, as I do, to the Council now and saying 'Give me this money for Heaven's sake, let me pay the compensation, and have done with it', I am only doing exactly what Mr. Ramalinga Reddi would wish.

"Mr. Tanikachalam Chettiyar, Sir, fell into a certain number of errors. He mentioned that certain persons never made claims. They made claims to the extent of many lakhs of rupees, but when we started the loan policy,

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[2nd February 1923]

Grant XXXII--cont.

we did so in accordance with certain established rules. The loans were granted under the Agriculturists' Loans Act. Only certain persons are qualified to come under that Act and take loans, and it is in regard to persons who are not so qualified that we now want to utilize the residue left after wiping out the loans. It is only fair that we should consider their claims. There is no question here, Sir, of inviting people to make their claims, nor do I see any prospect of their making any more claims. It is now 18 months, Sir, since the rebellion, and I have no reason to suppose that any more claims will come hereafter. By this time every-one who is going to claim has claimed.

"Sir, I have already explained that I was taken aback by the tendency on the part of the House to repudiate a promise of the Government which I thought they would accept as undoubtedly the proper policy, and that repudiation, Sir, has made a considerable difference in my position. I cannot but regard the refusal of the House to make this grant which is needed to give Malabar a chance of settling down as entirely unsympathetic, whatever may be said to the contrary. But in all the circumstances I have come to the conclusion that the best thing I can do is not to press the Demand now but to reserve it and put it forward in the next budget (cheers). May I have your permission, Sir, not to press it?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Will the hon. Member tell me under what Standing Order?"

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"In the absence of a Standing Order, Sir, I understand the matter to be in your discretion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will take the sense of the House. I think the question of notice was referred to by more than one Member. I called for the papers and I find that the hon. the Home Member's notice is dated the 31st January and it came to the Secretary only yesterday. He said therein that he wanted this thing to be put before the House on the 3rd February, i.e., to-morrow. As the Secretary rightly assumed that it was an urgent matter and as it was decided only yesterday that there was to be no meeting on Saturday, he put it in the agenda for to-day. I think I owe that explanation to the House for its having come in that form to-day."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

IV

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF THE MADRAS UNIVERSITY, 1922--cont.

The following amendments were not moved:—

Clause 14—cont.

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—

100. *In item (2) for the word 'ten' wherever it occurs substitute the word 'seven'.*